

Remarks

Claims 1 to 9 were pending in the present application. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2.

§102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 3, 5, 8 to 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,354,747 ("Irie et al."). Applicant has amended claim 1, which now recites:

1. An optical assembly, comprising:

a package including an optoelectronic component;

an alignment feature mounted to a surface of the package; and

a sleeve defining a single bore with a constant inner diameter, wherein the alignment feature and a ferrule of a fiber optic connector are inserted into opposite ends of the bore to be aligned relative to each other.

Claim 1 (emphasis added). Applicant submits that Irie et al. does not disclose a sleeve having "a single bore with a constant inner diameter." Claim 1.

In most embodiments, Irie et al. discloses an alignment sleeve with a bore for receiving a ferrule and an insertion hole of varying inner diameter for receiving a head of an optical module. For example, in Figs. 1 and 2, an alignment sleeve 8 includes a bore 8b for receiving a ferrule 50 and an insertion hole 8a for receiving a front end part 2a of a head portion 2 of an optical module. Insertion hole 8a has a truncated cone shape so that its inner diameter decreases within alignment sleeve 8. Similar configurations are found in Figs. 4A, 5A, 5B, 5D, 6, 7A, 10A, 10B, 10C, 13A, 13B, 14A, and 14B.

In some embodiments, Irie et al. discloses two bores of different inner diameters for receiving the ferrule and the head of an optical module. For example, assuming for argument's sake that an insertion hole 40 in Fig. 8B has a constant inner diameter, alignment sleeve SL nonetheless has a bore 38 and a bore 40 with different inner diameters. Similar configurations are found in Figs. 9B and 17. Accordingly, amended claim 1 is patentable over Irie et al.


Claims 2 to 3, 5, 8 to 9 depend from amended claim 1 and are patentable over Irie et al. for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

§103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irie et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,158 ("Bartur et al."). Claim 4 depends from amended claim 1 and is patentable over the combined references for at least the same reasons claim 1 is patentable.

The Examiner rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irie et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,195,156 ("Freeman et al."). Claims 6 and 7 depend from amended claim 1 and are patentable over the combined references for at least the same reasons claim 1 is patentable.

In summary, claims 1 to 9 were pending in the above-identified application. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1 to 9. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at (408) 382-0480x206.

Certification of Facsimile Transmission	
I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.	
 Signature	6/24/2005 Date

Respectfully submitted,



David C. Hsia
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 46,235